

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-10 stand rejected. Claim 4 is herein cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 7 are herein amended. A marked up version of the pending claims is provided hereinabove.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Publication No. 2002/0021710 to Bold et al. (hereinafter Bold). Bold teaches a system for testing a telephone system local exchange. Bold teaches the use of a Serial Data Sequencer (SDS) from which telephone line data is transmitted and received. Bold also teaches that the SDS interfaces to the telephone line by way of a T1/E1 daughter card.

In contrast to Bold, claim 1 has been amended to include that the first module includes a first physical interface and that the first module is running a first protocol. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the second interface has a second physical interface and is also running the first protocol. Thus, the same protocol is being run on two different modules over two different physical interfaces. For example, the first module includes a T1 interface and is running the T1 protocol, while the second module includes an E1 interface but is also running the T1 protocol.

Therefore, since Bold does not teach a first interface on a first module, a second interface on a second module and wherein the first module runs a first protocol while the second module also runs the first protocol, while amended claim 1 recites such language, amended claim 1 is believed allowable over Bold. Claim 4 has been canceled. Claims 2-3 and 5-7 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable.

Applicants submit that claim 2 is further patentably distinct over Bold, since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... wherein said first physical interface and said second physical interface are selected from the group consisting of T1, E1, T3 and E3." as required by claim 2. Bold uses a T1/E1 interface for the interface board, but not for the SDS module. If the

SDS module were supplied with a physical interface selected from a T1, E1, T3 or E3 interfaces, there would be no need for the interface board which the SDS communicates through to connect to the telephone line. Therefore, since the Bold reference fails to disclose that the first and second physical interface are selected from the group consisting of T1, E1, T3 and E3, while claim 2 recites such, claim 2 is believed allowable over Bold.

Applicants also submit that claim 6 is further patentably distinct over Bold, since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...changing a configuration of said system from one associated with said first physical interface to one associated with said second physical interface" as required by claim 6. Bold uses a T1/E1 interface for the interface board, but not for the SDS module which uses a VXI interface. The system configuration therefore cannot be changed from one associated with a T1/E1 configuration to one associated with a VXI configuration. Therefore, since the Bold reference fails to disclose changing a configuration of the system from one associated with the first physical interface to one associated with the second physical interface, while claim 6 recites such, claim 6 is believed allowable over Bold.

Applicants further submit that amended claim 7 is further patentably distinct over Bold, since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...making the interface channels appear contiguous across said first physical interface and said second physical interface" as required by claim 7. Bold uses a T1/ E1 interface for the interface board, but not for the SDS module which uses a VXI interface. The VXI interface does not include multiple channels and cannot be made to give the appearance of contiguous channels across the T1/E1 interface and the VXI interface. Therefore, since the Bold reference fails to disclose or suggest making the channels appear contiguous across the first and second physical interfaces while claim 7 recites such, claim 7 is believed allowable over Bold.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bold is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bold in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,793,415 to Gregory (hereinafter Gregory). Claims 8-10

depend from amended claim 1 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bold in view of Gregory is believed to have been overcome

In view of the above, the Examiners rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing claims 1-3 and 5-10 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

The prior art made of record is not believed to disclose or suggest the present invention.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

Respectfully submitted,

Chapin & Huang LLC

By: David W. Rouille  
David W. Rouille  
Reg. No. 40,150  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Westborough Office Park  
1700 West Park Drive  
Westborough, MA 01581  
Tel.: (508) 366-9600  
Fax: (508) 616-9805

Attorney Docket No.: EMP04-09

Dated: April 16, 2004